

SAMPLE SCOPES OF WORK

ACCELERATING ECONOMIC RECOVERY FOR ASIA:

KENAN INSTITUTE ASIA EVALUATION AND SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

DELIVERY ORDER STATEMENT OF WORK

I BACKGROUND

A. GENERAL

The unexpected financial and social crisis in Asia created an unprecedented focus on the weaknesses of the Asian economies and called into question the existing architecture of the international financial system. Addressing the root causes of the crisis became increasingly imperative after other countries, including the United States, felt the reverberations of the Asian crisis in their own economies.

Analyses of the crisis, along with field inquiries, indicated that among the affected countries, Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines demonstrated the highest levels of need for USAID assistance. In response, USAID designed the "Accelerating Economic Recovery in Asia" (AERA) initiative to help the region, and particularly these three countries, recover from the financial crisis. The initiative helps these countries address key weaknesses in their economic, governance and social systems. These weaknesses must be resolved to restore investor and bank confidence, and revive the credit and investment flows needed to revitalize business activity that will lead to economic recovery.

Recognizing that an effective response must address both the underlying causes of the crisis and resultant social impacts, as well as take steps to ensure sustainability, the initiative has pursued its objective by:

- restarting bank and business activity;
- improving transparency and accountability in banks, businesses and governments;
- establishing more effective mechanisms that alleviate the social tensions and adverse impact associated with economic adjustments.

AERA activities are closely linked and coordinated with World Bank and Asian Development Bank crisis response efforts. The AERA program brings technical assistance and training that complement ongoing structural adjustment loans being funded by the International Monetary Fund or the multilateral development banks.

B. PROJECT FUNDING

Since 1999, USAID has provided \$18 million in grant support to Kenan Institute Asia (KIASia). USAID funding concluded with the FY2001 obligation, although the life of the grant has been extended to 2005 to complete implementation of program activities.

C. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The AERA program initiated activities in Indonesia and the Philippines in July 1999 and in Thailand in October 1999. As this evaluation concerns only the AERA program activities implemented in Thailand by USAID's principal partner, Kenan Institute Asia (KIASia), this section limits its discussion to that component of the AERA program.

In order to continue the successful business and institutional cooperation begun under the U.S.-Thai Development Partnership, USAID helped to establish a financially viable and self-sustaining institution--the Kenan Institute Asia. Established in August 1996 through an endowment from three contributors, USAID, the Royal Thai Government and the Kenan Charitable Trust, KIASia promotes U.S. and Thai linkages and expanded Thai and U.S. development cooperation.

Under AERA, KIASia has been USAID's partner in promoting reform and accelerating economic recovery in three specific ways—

- strengthening the enabling environment for small and medium enterprises
- developing partnerships between Thai and US business support organizations to strengthen the regulatory and competitive environment, business standards, and good governance practices of the Thai private sector
- improving the competitiveness of SMEs through firm-level assistance that enhances management capabilities and technical skills.

Strengthening the Enabling Environment

The Bank of Thailand began a reform program to strengthen the banking system and improve bank regulations following the financial crisis. Banks also recognized their weaknesses and accepted that they needed to adopt important changes in order to survive. USAID provided funding for advisory services to the Bank of Thailand and for the Bank Training Program in order to help these institutions adopt needed reforms in the areas of credit management, risk management, training for SME customers in the preparation of business plans, and improved internal control and governance.

In 2001, the second year of the Bank Training Program, KIASia continued to provide additional training to those banks supported in year one to create a deeper impact. The program added a new component that focused on improving the capacity of government banks to carry out community lending and microcredit.

Business Support Organizations

The Business Support Organization Partnership (BSOP) support financial and business governance support organizations that will play a role in ongoing reform and sustainable economic growth. The program matches those Thai organizations with US organizations that have similar operations and possess “assets” such as experience, technology, training materials, information systems, and practices that could be of benefit to their Thai partners. Assisted Thai organizations include the Thai Bond Dealing Center and the Government Pension Fund. Organizations include several independent agencies tasked with promoting a more transparent and fair business environment such as the Mediation Center for Financial Disputes, the Secured Transactions Registration Office, the Credit Bureau Supervisory Agency, the Court of Justice, and the Administrative Court.

Improving SME Competitiveness through Firm-Level Assistance

The USAID-funded Business Advisory Center (BAC) works with Thai SMEs to promote competitiveness by enhancing their management capabilities and technical skills, as well as to access sources of finance. US and Thai business consultants work with clients to conduct problem analyses and develop scopes of work to address issues faced by the SMEs. BAC staff often directly provides the expertise called for under the scope of work. However, BAC also taps the volunteer expertise of the Thai Volunteer Consulting Services, the International Executive Service Corps, the Citizens Democracy Corps, and ACDI/VOCA. Focus areas include international marketing, plant process improvement, computerization of production, environmental management, quality control, e-commerce, human resource management, and strategy development. During the first two years, the BAC completed 126 consulting projects and is managing another 110 on-going projects. Combined the BAC has reached 201 SMEs, providing training to 1,300 SME managers.

Two smaller and more recently initiated projects have also been implemented: The IT and Education Project and the Cluster Competitiveness Project.

I EVALUATION SCOPE

ARTICLE I—TITLE

Project evaluation and sustainability assessment of the Kenan Institute Asia (KIASia)–implemented activities under USAID’s Accelerating Economic Recovery in Asia Program (AERA).

ARTICLE II---OBJECTIVE

The overarching objective of this evaluation is to examine issues concerned with KIASia long-term sustainability, and assess the impact to date of the AERA program in Thailand in developing sustainable regulatory and institutional capacity to support small and medium enterprises in a cost-effective manner. These findings will assist USAID in planning future activities.

ARTICLE III---STATEMENT OF WORK

The contractor will provide a team to conduct a final evaluation of the AERA/Thailand activities implemented by KIASia, and assess KIASia's capacity to be financially self-sustaining given its current operating policies, procedures and level of demand for its current services. The team will develop and adopt an approach that elicits and analyzes information, and provides conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned on the issues below. The evaluation team will draw on project documentation and reports as well as structured interviews with project participants and partners.

1. **EFFICIENCY:** Are the results being obtained by KIASia being produced at an acceptable cost compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same objectives?
2. **IMPACT:** What has been the quantitative and qualitative impact of USAID-funded activities in each of the three areas where KIASia is working? Is there evidence of any impact beyond those organizations directly supported? How has USAID-funded support to KIASia's partners in Thailand made a difference in the development of the SME sector? What effect did the approach adopted by KIASia have on the impact achieved? What specific impact did KIASia's USAID-funded activities have on the ability of the Government of Thailand to strengthen the regulatory environment for SME development? Has KIASia direct assistance to SMEs made a difference in those enterprises' abilities to compete? Assess the effectiveness of the projects in accordance with the success indicators set by USAID (see Appendix A).
3. **SUSTAINABILITY:** As currently implemented, are KIASia's activities likely to engender sustainable development impacts after USAID funding have stopped? Will the organizations supported under AERA, whether business support organizations or independent agencies, have the capacity to provide future support to the SME sector when USAID funding has stopped?

The elements that are to be examined for the study and for developing a strategy for institutional sustainability are expected to include, but are not limited to, the following tasks:

- a) Assess the current state of the KIASia's organization development. This benchmarking exercise will evaluate institutional issues such as administration, demand for services, finance and budgets, human resource capacities, general management and governance. The results of the appraisal stage are expected to provide a foundation of general information with sufficient levels of detail from which a strategy for institutional sustainability may be outlined. Illustratively the components to be reviewed during the benchmarking exercise include:
 - ❖ **Administration:** This section will examine KIASia's organizational and administrative structures including chain-of-command, personnel

responsibilities, span-of-control, approval processes, facilities appropriateness and administrative efficiencies.

- ❖ Demand for Services: A key issue for developing a cogent strategy for sustainability involves understanding the basis of and demand for the services currently provided. Therefore, an assessment of the nature and scope of services offered will be developed as well as analyses of KIAAsia's clients.
- ❖ Finance and Budgets: At the core of institutional longevity is an organization's financial soundness. KIAAsia's current budget/financial situation will be examined to gain an understanding of its financial strengths and weaknesses and its source and use of funds.
- ❖ Human capacity: An overview of the qualifications of the staff, trainers and their responsibilities will be compiled as part of understanding the institutional capacities of KIAAsia.
- ❖ Management and Governance: Organization policies will be reviewed to assess their contribution to encouraging institutional self-sufficiency or to constraining it. The role and responsibilities of management and of the Board of Directors will also be examined as well as the organization dynamics between them and with KIAAsia's constituencies.

b) Sustainability Strategy Development: This task will use as its starting point the benchmarking appraisal which examined the essential factors relating to the capacity of the KIAAsia to evolve into a self-sustaining organization. Designing a strategy to shift the institutional framework from donor dependency to a self-sustaining organization frequently requires altering organizational attitudes and behavior, perspectives, plans and long-term vision. Consequently, some of the elements of the strategic plan to be considered will include:

- ❖ Statement of Mission Goals and Vision: The strategy will development recommendations for a mission, goals and a long-term vision which is acceptable to KIAAsia management.
- ❖ Financial Self-sufficiency: A plan for moving from dependency to financial self-sufficiency will be discussed in the context an overall organization strategy.
- ❖ Governance: Changes to policies, regulations and administrative processes will also be considered to conform to the organization's new sustainability mandate.
- ❖ Priority Services: demand-driven services will be identified and a strategy for prioritizing programs developed.
- ❖ Constituencies: Strategies for identifying current and potential constituents will help lay the foundation for generating resources. A systematic approach to profiling clients and constituents will be outlined.
- ❖ Pricing: The cost of providing services, the revenue generated and the competitive markets will be discussed for the purpose of determining pricing policies for niche markets and services demanded.

- ❖ **Cost Recovery:** There may be opportunities for recuperating costs generated from the sale of services. Recommendation for approaches to cost recovery will be discussed in the context of an overall strategic direction.
- ❖ **External Funding:** Strategies will be reviewed for identifying potential sources of external funding, i.e., other donors, collaboration with other NGOs, international organizations, etc.
- ❖ **Marketing and Delivery of Services:** An examination of the methodology used to market KIAAsia's services and the vehicles for delivering them will also be reviewed in the context of strategy development.
- ❖ **Administration:** assessments of the process and systems of accounting and financial management, management information system design, physical infrastructure, management and organization structure and policy development will be discussed as critical elements in framing a self-sufficiency strategy.

ARTICLE IV---METHODOLOGY

On-sight research and interviews for the study will be carried out in Bangkok, Thailand for approximately 20 person-days. The team will interview KIAAsia staff, managers, board directors, participants, government officials, clients, potential donors and constituents. Written evaluations of KIAAsia and its published materials will be reviewed. Policies and administrative procedures will be examined with management during this on-sight phase of the study.

An additional ten person-days are required for the team to draft the findings of the benchmarking and strategy development research.

ARTICLE V---REPORTS AND DELIVERABLES

1. **Draft Work Plan.** The evaluation team will develop a draft work plan prior to departure from Washington, DC.
2. **Oral Presentation.** The evaluation team will provide an oral briefing of its findings and recommendations to the USAID Thailand program manager, Tom Elam; USAID regional mission representative, Scott Harding; and to the ANE Regional Program Manager USAID/W, Rebecca Maestri.
3. **Draft Report.** The evaluation team will present a draft report in English of its findings and recommendations to the ANE Regional Program Manager and KIAAsia within ten business days from the time of return to the United States.
4. **Final Report.** Ten paper copies of the Final Report as well as an electronic version in Word 97 shall be submitted within 15 days following receipt of comments for USAID and KIAAsia. Ten copies will be provided to Rebecca Maestri, Regional Program Manager, USAID/W. The final report should include an executive summary

of not more than four pages, a copy of this scope of work, evaluation questionnaires, lists of persons and organizations contacted, etc.

ARTICLE VI--RELATIONSHIPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluation team will receive technical direction from and report to Ms. Rebecca Maestri, Regional Program Manager, USAID/Washington or her designee.

ARTICLE VII—PERFORMANCE PERIOD

Approximately six person-months to begin as soon as possible.

ARTICLE VII--WORK DAYS ORDERED

Approximately 120 person-days.

ARTICLE VIII---SPECIAL PROVISIONS

1. DUTY POST

Bangkok, Thailand

2. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS AND OTHER REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS

English. Thai desired.

3. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Not Applicable

4. LOGISTIC SUPPORT

Limited logistical support will be provided by the US Embassy, Bangkok. The Kenan Institute Asia will provide assistance in setting up interviews with Thai government officials, USAID representatives, US embassy officials, Kenan staff, etc.

5. WORK WEEK

A six-day workweek is authorized while in Thailand.

Technical Qualifications and Experience Requirements for the Evaluation Team

1. Team Leader/Evaluation Specialist

The team leader shall be an evaluation specialist who has at least 10 years experience with developmental projects in emerging economies. The individual's

knowledge and familiarity of USAID process and procedures is desired. The individual shall have excellent written and oral communication skills, as well as exceptional organizational and analytical capabilities. The team leader shall have solid working knowledge of sustainable institutional characteristics and dynamics.

2. Private Sector Specialist

The private sector specialist shall have a minimum of 10 years experience working on private sector development programs in emerging economies. The individual shall have analytical skills in the following technical areas: prudential commercial bank lending practices, SME capacity building; and institutional business support services.

AERA THAILAND: INDICATORS AND TARGETS

The following narrative and tables define the indicators and associated targets for the Thailand component of the regional AERA Program. In some cases, activities clearly and directly contribute to one of the Intermediate Objectives (IO) for AERA, while contributing indirectly to another IO. In the indicator tables, activities are grouped under the IO to which they most directly contribute. Indirect, but important contributions of other IOs are discussed in the narrative.

I. INTERMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 1: BANK AND BUSINESS ACTIVITY RESTARTED

The principal activity contributing to this IO is the Business Advisory Center (BAC) within the Kenan Institute. The BAC provides direct, targeted assistance to small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Small firms are defined as having less than Baht 20 million in fixed assets, not including land. Medium-sized enterprises are classified as those having fixed assets not including land that total between Baht 20-200 million. On occasion, larger firms may receive technical assistance from the BAC if important multiplier effects can be identified or if the firms pay for all costs of the assistance. However, the vast majority of assistance will be provided to small and medium-sized firms, as defined above.

The BAC can provide assistance in a variety of areas important to restarting business activity and stimulating the growth of SMEs, including general management, quality control, production, accounting and financial control, marketing, and others

Through this assistance, SMEs will be better operated and more capable of performing the required range of management functions. For example, firms receiving assistance in accounting and finance will have more accurate and transparent accounting records and financial statements, facilitating the process of raising capital (short- or long-term), including bank loans. Assistance in the other areas above will likewise improve specific firm capabilities. Often this help will be in the form of **business planning**, which will vary in scope, depending on the size and type of business. In some cases the assistance will involve only one aspect of planning, such as marketing planning. Although several indicators along these lines were considered, the ability to use sound business planning is considered the most appropriate for capturing the entire range of expected improvements. Therefore, **Indicator 1 is: Business plans (or parts of business plans) developed by SMEs assisted by the BAC.** To measure this indicator, BAC will follow up with SMEs that have received assistance. It is projected that at least 50% of these SMEs will continue to develop and use some form of business planning in-house. The review of SMEs will be conducted six months and one year after the BAC assistance has been completed.

The improved capabilities of SMEs in the areas of BAC assistance, absent uncontrollable external factors such as recession, should normally lead to increased sales, both

domestically and overseas. **Indicator 2 is: Total revenue of assisted SMEs.** This indicator is a high level measure which will require improved firm-level capabilities in some of the key problem areas facing Thailand's SMEs. The target for this indicator is the average percentage of growth in total revenue achieved by firms receiving BAC assistance. The percentage increase in total revenue for each firm will be checked one year after the completion of BAC assistance and compared to the same quarter in the previous year. Another indicator will be the number of firms served. Since the firms must pay part of the costs of the service, the willingness of firms to pay for the service should be a good indicator of its perceived value to them. The targets for number of firms are cumulative and firms receiving assistance in the first year will continue to be monitored.

II. INTERMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 2: CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE IMPROVED

Three AERA activities contribute directly to this objective. The bank training program provides a range of training programs to Thai commercial banks, including risk management, credit analysis and management, internal control, and responsibility accounting. Through this training, banks will be better prepared to face the challenges of recovery in the financial sector. In each case, training materials will be developed for future use by banks' training staff. In addition to the specific content and objectives of each individual training program, banks will be left with training staffs capable of developing and conducting training in other areas. Based on the training, banks will more effectively implement new policies and procedures to guide operations. For example, one bank has requested assistance to train a cadre of employees in all aspects of dealing with SMEs. When the program is completed, the bank will establish new policies and systems for loans and other assistance to SMEs. In several other cases, banks are receiving assistance in credit analysis and overall credit management. This training will result in more thorough credit reviews, including the establishment of new policies and procedures for credit analysis and approval. The bank training activity will have a significant impact on bank operations, resulting in better management of credit portfolios and improved risk assessment capabilities. This, in turn, will have an impact on the level of NPLs in the future for banks receiving training in related areas.

BSOP partnerships include assistance providers; oversight and regulatory organizations; and organizations which set and monitor financial and business standards. As a result, new policies, standards, and systems and procedures will be developed and in place which will improve governance and enhance investor and consumer confidence. For example, a partnership between the American Bankruptcy Institute and the Thai Central Bankruptcy Court is intended to improve the Thai court's capacity to administer bankruptcy cases by putting new procedures and administrative systems in place. Another partnership, between the Thai Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the U.S. Treasury Department is intended to lead to the development and implementation of new Savings and Investment Tax Policies.

The BSOP will also be an important activity to promote long-term sustainability of the programs started under AERA. Although every US-Thai partnership created through

BSOP will focus on immediate problems and not necessarily continue, many will establish formal and informal relationships, which will endure after AERA funding is completed. The US and Thai entities involved in these partnerships will continue to cooperate to solve key problems and to promote good governance, as well as to stimulate economic growth. For example, the proposed partnership between the Thai Bankers Association and the American Bankers Association should continue to deliver a broad spectrum of training to the Thai banking sector without USAID funding and long-term relationships will be developed between US and Thai organizations and associations.

The third activity under IO2 is assistance to the Bank of Thailand (BOT) from the U.S. Department of Treasury. This activity is providing workshops and on-the-job training for BOT bank supervisors. In addition, a new supervision and examination manual is being developed for BOT staff. The result will be more focussed examinations that concentrate on key commercial bank operations and financial indicators. BOT bank examiners will be better equipped to identify problems and recommend solutions to both commercial banks and the BOT.

Three indicators have been set for IO2:

Indicator 1: The number of banks that receive AERA bank training that implement new policies, systems, and procedures.

The number of banks taking such actions will serve as a simple measurement of achievement. However, achievement in this area cannot be reduced to a number. Narrative reports on the kinds of actions taken and the relative success of those actions will be helpful in assessing the success of the bank training program. Separate indicator tables have been developed for the bank training and BSOP activities. Each training program and partnership will focus on a specific outcome that will establish new policies, systems or procedures to improve performance and governance, thereby restoring customer and investor confidence.

Indicator 2: Commercial bank training activities in related topics developed and conducted beyond AERA assistance.

The number of such training courses, demonstrating an institutional impact emanating from the initial training activities will measure this indicator. It is expected that in some cases, training staff at each bank will continue to develop and conduct training courses, workshops, using the ideas, skills and materials provided through AERA assistance. In some cases, new courses may be conducted. In other cases, the course conducted under AERA may be repeated by bank staff for other audiences (e.g., at “up-country” branches).

Indicator 3: Number of partnerships between U.S. and Thai entities still active at the end of the reporting period.

One of the key features of the partnership approach is the development of long-term relationships between U.S. and Thai organizations. The continued existence of these partnerships will demonstrate the sustainability and efficiency of this approach. The

number of partnerships implementing activities at the end of each reporting period will measure this indicator.

INTERMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 3: IMPROVED COVERAGE AND TARGETTING OF SOCIAL SAFETY NETS (This needs further revision and review)

The AERA program in Thailand contains one activity contributing to this IO. A program to address the problem of malaria on Thai border areas will be implemented, focusing on MDR malaria. A community-based approach will be used to increase awareness, change behavior, and improve malaria-related services in clinics, mobile medical units and local community organizations. A variety of delivery mechanisms will be used, including health volunteers, health PVOs operating along border areas, and Ministry of Public Health programs. The **Indicator** for this IO is **the number of clinics and other organizations providing MDR malaria services**. Success will be evaluated by the increase in the number of service providers. The program planning committee in March 2000 will set the baseline and specific targets. The committee will include representatives from all participating groups, including USAID health experts from Washington. The baseline and targets will be established and submitted to ANE/SEA in time for the R4 review.

Indicator tables for Business Advisory Center

Intermediate Objective 1

Bank and Business Activity Restarted

Indicators	Total number of SMEs receiving AERA consulting assistance Increase in gross revenue
Unit of Measure	Number of firms assisted Average percentage change in gross revenue on the part of assisted firms.
Source	Company records and company reports to BAC
Indicator Description	Current GDP growth projections for Thailand are in the 2.5% range. SMEs receiving AERA assistance are expected to perform at least twice as well and a target of 5% growth in total revenue have been set. One year after assistance, firms' revenue for the most recent quarter will be compared to the same quarter the previous year.

Year	Target # of Assisted SMEs Cumulative	Actual # of Assisted SMEs Cumulative	Actual Average % Increase
2000	20		
2001	120		
2002	220		
2003	320		
2004	410		
2005	500		

Indicator tables for Business Advisory Center

Intermediate Objective 1 Bank and Business Activity Restarted

Indicator	Business plans or elements of business plans in use by SMEs receiving AERA assistance.
Unit of Measure	Percentage of SMEs with current business planning.
Source	Company follow-up reviews by BAC.
Indicator Description	Each SME receiving assistance will be encouraged where appropriate to use business planning methodologies. The percentage of firms that continue to maintain that planning one year after assistance is projected at 50%.

Year	Target	Actual
1999	0	Baseline - 0
2000	50%	
2001	50%	
2002	50%	
2003	50%	
2004	50%	
2005	50%	

Indicator tables for Bank Training Program

Intermediate Objective 2 Corporate and Financial Governance Improved

Indicator	Policies, systems, or procedures adopted by the participating banks
Unit of Measure	Number of participating banks implementing new policies, systems, or procedures
Source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Executive orders, and implementing rules and regulations of the participating banks ◆ Reports from the participating banks
Indicator Description	1. Implementation of new procedures and systems related to the training courses, i.e. new Credit Policies or Credit Policy Manuals, Risk Management Procedures, Internal Control Systems, Responsibility Accounting Centers or Systems

Year	Target # of banks Cumulative	Actual # of banks Cumulative
1999	0	Baseline - 0
2000	4	
2001	5	
2002	10	
2003	12	

Intermediate Objective 2 Corporate and Financial Governance Improved

Indicator	Training activities in related topics
Unit of Measure	Number of banks continuing training programs using concepts, skills and materials provided through AERA assistance
Source	Training units of the participating banks
Indicator Description	1. Number of banks conducting related courses, including development of the Manuals and

Guidebooks developed to the Banks' training units

Year	Target # of banks Cumulative	Actual # of banks Cumulative
1999	0	Baseline - 0
2000	3	
2001	6	
2002	10	
2003	12	
2004	12	

Indicator tables for Business Support Organizations Partnering Program

Intermediate Objective 2 Corporate and Financial Governance Improved

Indicator	Policies, systems, or procedures adopted by participating partner organizations
Unit of Measure	Number of participating organizations implementing policies, systems, or procedures introduced or strengthened through the partnership fostered by the BSOP
Source	Participating US and Thai partner organizations
Indicator Description	<p>Key organizations and measures targeted for reform include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. American Bankruptcy Institute providing technical assistance to the Thai Central Bankruptcy Court to improve court administration systems. 2. Thai Securities and Exchange Commission with assistance from the US Treasury Department to conduct Comparative Study on Thailand's Savings and Investment Tax Policy in order to

-
- strengthen tax policies and administration.
3. Thailand Rating Information Services to receive technical assistance to raise its bond rating capabilities thereby improving internal systems.
 4. Thai Bankers Association and American Bankers Association (ABA) to partner and deliver new training programs and services to Thai bankers.
 5. Institute of Certified Auditors and Accountants of Thailand is to produce multimedia education materials and establish new training methods for accounting professors with assistance from US university.
 6. Securities Analyst Association to develop handbook covering new market instruments with technical assistance from American Institute for Management Research. The manual is to be used for training CFA students.
 7. S&T Competitiveness partnership between Office of Economic & Technologies Competitiveness, and US Council for Competitiveness, is to increase the competitiveness of Thailand's science and technology.
 8. APICS certification to be established with Thailand Logistics and Production Society to improve operations management and logistics capabilities and systems in Thai industry.
 9. Technical assistance to be provided to the Thai Credit Bureau by a US counterpart in order to establish its operational procedures.
 10. The Association of Thai Small and Medium Entrepreneurs (ATSME) to partner with the US Small Business Administration to establish better services and capabilities.
-

Year	Expected Measures Cumulative	Actual
1999	0	Baseline - 0
2000	2	
2001	7	
2002	10	
2003	15	
2004	20	

2005	25
------	----

Intermediate Objective 2 Financial and Corporate Governance Improved

Indicator The number of long-term partnerships initiated and maintained

Unit of Measure Number of partnerships

Source Participating US and Thai partner organizations

Indicator Description Partnerships between US and Thai organizations continuing to implement joint activities at the end of the reporting period

Year	Expected Partnerships Cumulative	Actual
1999	0	Baseline - 0
2000	2	
2001	4	
2002	8	
2003	12	
2004	10	
2005	8	

**Europe and Eurasia Regional Assessment
Impact of Community Development on Conflict Prevention, Resolution, and
Mitigation and the Development of Democracy**

Scope of Work

PURPOSE OF THE ASSESSMENT

This report will assess the community development and conflict literature and evaluate the impact of USAID community development (CD) projects on conflict prevention, resolution, and mitigation through local democratic development. The assessment will examine the effects of CD projects on conflict prevention, conflict mitigation, and the development of democracy for three USAID programs in the Europe and Eurasia (E&E) region: the Central Asian Republics (CAR) or Georgia Macedonia, and Serbia (post

conflict). These three cases have been chosen for their pre-conflict, in-conflict, and post-conflict countries. The final report will describe and analyze key CD factors that affect the risks of conflict and development of democracy, summarizing lessons learned about how, when and under what conditions CD projects are most likely to contribute to conflict prevention, resolution, and mitigation and best support the development of democratic institutions and societies. In so doing, the assessment will contribute to the development of the E&E Bureau's conflict prevention strategy and to the design and modification of CD projects in the field.¹

I BACKGROUND

U.S. foreign assistance policy is increasingly focused on preventing and mitigating conflict within developing and transitioning countries.² The rationale is that, if conflict occurs, development is undermined, the potential for future development is impeded, and the instability from conflict risks becoming the breeding ground for transnational crime and international terrorism. USAID plays a central role in developing institutions to better enable communities and nations to deal with conflict.

The E&E Bureau is developing a strategic approach to assess and manage conflict. Explicit in this strategy is the use of community development programming as well as other types of conflict prevention activities. The Bureau and Missions need to know how, when and under what conditions CD approaches contribute to reduced tension and defuse potential conflicts, as well as how CD approaches might contribute to mitigating the costs of past conflict and reducing the possibility of renewed conflict

The decline of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe and the collapse of the Soviet Union has resulted in violent conflict as part of the transition in many countries of the region. In the past decade, twelve of the twenty-seven transition countries in E&E have suffered from significant violent conflict. The Balkans, the Caucasus region, and the Central Asian Republics, in particular, have been and continue to be conflict prone.

The potential for further conflict in the E&E region remains significant, as illustrated by recent upheavals in Bosnia, Croatia, Kosovo, and Macedonia. In each of these places, future conflict is a distinct possibility from continuing political, ethnic, economic and social tensions. The potential for conflict exists more generally across Europe (e.g.,

¹See also: *"A Strategy for Addressing Conflict in Eastern Europe & Eurasia Bureau"* August 2002. EE/PO.

² Conflict is defined as a struggle over values or claims to status, power, and scarce yet economically viable resources, among two or more parties that perceive incompatible interests or express hostile attitudes. Conflict Prevention activities target actions, policies, procedures, institutions, or conditions such that socio-cultural, economic, or political divisions are minimized, thus fostering cooperation and forestalling broad-based instability and violent conflict that set back investments in long-term sustainable development. Conflict mitigation efforts contain and reduce violence as a way of lessening the severity of adverse effects on the people and the investments in those countries. Conflict resolution efforts find an end to ongoing conflict through mediation, alternative dispute resolution, or other arbitration. Conflict reconciliation involves the re-establishment of, and cooperation among, governmental apparatus and civil society in the short-term and long-term.

Bulgaria) and Eurasia (the former-Soviet Union states) as reform support wanes, following particularly protracted political and economic transition periods that have not adequately addressed social demands. The importance of creating a more effective conflict prevention paradigm is underscored by the alarming trends forecasted in *Global Trends 2015*.

The root causes of conflict are often related to the absence of democracy and the failure of the economic system to provide appropriate freedom and prosperity. When groups within a country lack peaceful channels to voice their issues and petition for equal access, the potential for conflict exists. Often "bread and butter" economic issues provide the spark that unleashes conflict, particularly where ethnic divisions and religious acrimony are present. The presence of conflict, in other words, is one of the most salient indicators that democratic and economic systems are not working.

Violent conflicts have resulted in widespread death, destruction, and large numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons. They have disrupted livelihoods, exposed persons to unheard of cruelty and violence, intensified fear and hatred between different ethnic and religious groups, and challenged the territorial integrity of some states. Violent conflict has also impeded the reform of the political, economic, and social protection systems in these states, and reduced living standards still further as a result. Conflicts have led to the destruction of the physical infrastructure of the economy as well as the political and social infrastructure. Often, unless there is a partition arrangement, citizens return to their communities to live side by side with former adversaries. These legacies leave post conflict societies shaped to a large extent by the response of the population to the challenges presented by the violence, displacement, and breakdown of political, economic, and social institutions.

Community development projects have been introduced in many post-conflict societies as the major programmatic element in USAID's response to these intrastate and interstate conflicts.

Community development is a broad term (see Appendix A for a list of definitions) used to describe a variety of activities at the local level in which communities drive and control the decisions and actions that affect their lives. In other words, community development is a mechanism for active citizen participation and local collaboration in the selection and implementation of activities that have tangible community-level benefits. Through this approach, various sectors of the community are often brought into productive partnerships. The scope of such projects is broad and can focus on expansion of education and health care delivery services, local infrastructure rehabilitation, job creation, environmental problem solving, and strengthening of social capital³.

³ "Whereas physical capital refers to physical objects and human capital refers to the properties of individuals, social capital refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. In that sense social capital is closely related to what some have called "civic virtue." The difference is that "social capital" calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a sense network of reciprocal social relations. A society of

Understanding the relationship between CD projects and conflict is far from complete. Nonetheless, many CD practitioners/experts believe that by their proto-democratic and participatory nature, CD projects model democratic behavior and establish other venues/mechanisms for managing potential conflict between non-homogenous groups and local actors with differing perspectives on key issues. Such projects may help reduce conflict by constructing synergies and building consensus and by empowering/mobilizing citizens to identify unmet needs and solve their own problems. It has also been observed that CD projects can provide individuals hope that social inequalities such as poverty and unemployment can be overcome, and that a brighter future can be realized. With such an outlook conflict may be less likely to ensue, as fewer citizens feel marginalized and social dissatisfaction dissipates.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

A. Problem Analysis

Community development activities have a long track record in international development and are not new to the E&E region. Current CD projects in the E&E Bureau appear based on integrated rural development models from the 1980s. But unlike integrated rural development, broader community development takes place in both rural and urban settings. Many E&E missions have CD programs that do not include conflict prevention/mitigation as an explicit (measurable) project outcome and focus on infrastructure rehabilitation or income-generating activities through principles of community engagement/capacity building. This assessment will not examine these types of CD projects but focus on CD projects that aim to reduce the risks of conflict and support democratic development in communities.

In general, CD projects introduce techniques to mobilize community participation and enhance the capacity of community organizations to address a range of community problems: rebuilding infrastructure (Bosnia, Kosovo, Serbia, Central Asian Republics), creating employment (Bosnia, Central Asia), improving health and education (Armenia), reducing human suffering (Georgia), and resettling refugees (Serbia, Bosnia).

For the majority of CD projects in the EE region there is an assumption that an increase in cooperative action among community residents will bring about ethnic, religious, or sectarian cohesion—either within a particular country or across national boundaries. The presumed outcome is that increased cohesion will contribute to a reduction in conflict or will prevent conflict from erupting. Thus, while conflict prevention is not typically a primary objective of the EE programs, it is often an implicit secondary objective.

At the end of hostile actions in Kosovo in 1999, the U.S. Government designed a CD project to address the needs at the community level, and to accelerate the return of normal

many virtuous but isolated individuals is not necessarily rich in social capital." (Robert Putnam. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. 2000: 19)

life in the villages and towns of the region.⁴ The Kosovo CD project evaluation, however, focused primarily on the rebuilding public utilities and buildings (markets, community centers, etc), and contributions of these to economic development. Any impact on reducing/preventing future conflict as a result of the community's involvement was not addressed.

By contrast, the Community Action Investment Program (CAIP) recently initiated in the Central Asian Republics, explicitly identifies conflict prevention as an objective. "The goal of (CAIP) activities is to enhance community participation in local development planning and decision making processes, strengthen community conflict prevention and resolution capacity, and increase income and employment opportunities for community members, in particular for women and youth." The communities selected are in impoverished, drought-affected and conflict-prone areas.

The E&E Bureau does not have a sound theoretical model nor empirical evidence to link CD projects with conflict prevention much less a system for determining what the best practices of community development vis-à-vis conflict are, given various obstacles in the region.⁵ Consequently, these costly programs are coming under increased scrutiny.

While the E&E Bureau has implemented numerous CD projects, the Bureau does not have a good understanding of the presumed causality/linkages, nor of the extent to which appropriately designed projects can better contribute to conflict prevention, mitigation, resolution, and reconciliation as well as the development of democracy in the region. There appears to be both a shortage of academic research on these topics and a wealth of as yet undocumented project experiences and lessons learned. This assessment will resolve both of these lacunae.

B. Working Assumptions and Hypotheses:

Assumption: Social capital is non-existent or weak in those areas where ethnic, religious, or sectarian conflict occurs; hence programs aimed at "building social capital" can prevent or mitigate conflict.

Hypothesis 1: Community development activities can overcome barriers to cooperation based on longstanding ethnic, religious, and sectarian conflict and increase in social capital based on diversity and inclusiveness.

Hypothesis 2: Communities with greater social capital are less at risk of conflict, better able to resolve conflicts, and more effective in mitigating the costs of past conflicts.

⁴ Garner, David et al. *Evaluation of "Parsons I" Project in Kosovo*. September 6, 2001.

⁵ These obstacles include lack of trust between the non-governmental, private and public sectors; lack of experience and skills for collaboration; limited understanding of the benefits of partnership and collaboration; no tradition of voluntary community involvement due to the socialistic tendency of governments to meet needs; imperfect or incomplete privatization of residential and commercial property; and limited resources available to communities.

III. OBJECTIVES FOR THIS SCOPE OF WORK

A. Objectives

The objective of this activity is to conduct an assessment of the E&E Bureau's activities that have been implemented for the primary or secondary goal of decreasing the likelihood of conflict between ethnic, religious, or communal groups within a single country or across national boundaries. The assessment will ascertain:

- What the literature says about the relationships between CD projects and conflict (developing an analytic model of how CD is supposed to influence conflict)
- How and to what extent project outcomes appear to have contributed to conflict prevention, mitigation, resolution, and/or reconciliation;
- Lessons learned in the implementation of projects, as they relate to decreasing the risk of conflict, resolving differences between groups of people, or mitigating conflict, including the pros and cons of different types of projects within the E&E region.

The assessment will examine USAID CD programs in pre-conflict CAR (Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan), in-conflict Macedonia (where the program was conceived prior to the conflict and has operated after the conflict as well), and post-conflict Serbia (although the impact of conflict has varied dramatically within Serbia). If there are problems with conducting the assessment in any of these countries, USAID and the contractor shall reach agreement on other E&E countries and programs for evaluation. In each country, the evaluation shall compare communities where CD approaches have been employed with those that have not had USAID or other donor engagement of this type.

B. Illustrative Research Questions

1. What does the literature review and the fieldwork say about the presumed relationship of community development and conflict prevention and/or conflict mitigation?

- Is there evidence that CD projects increase democracy and reduce conflict?
- What does the research say about when and under what circumstances CD projects reduce conflict? How? To what degree? Are there particular elements of CD projects that are more/less related to reducing conflict?

2. What does the literature review and fieldwork say regarding what circumstances CD projects are likely to be most effective in conflict mitigation/prevention?

The literature review should identify where and why CD and conflict prevention/mitigation have been successful/unsuccessful. The fieldwork shall consider the impact of CD projects in three countries/regions selected due to the variation in conflict. The fieldwork should assess how the results of CD projects vary (and are explained) by a host of variables, including the following:

- Countries (level of conflict, characteristics of democracy, level of economic development, ties to Europe, ethnic composition, social protection system);
- Communities (level of conflict, social composition, level of development, character of civil society, quality of local governance, ethnic composition, types of local issues in contention, local value structure);
- Objectives pursued (civic engagement, type of infrastructure rehabilitation, local economic development, job creation)
- How CD is implemented (case selection, comparison with any control cases (communities where CD is not implemented), role of new institutions, participation of pre-existing institutions, type of community participation, characteristics of community leaders, methods of facilitation, size of project, type of project, length of CD process).

3. Lessons Learned both from the literature review and fieldwork evaluations

- Where have CD projects most successfully contributed to the prevention and/or mitigation of conflict in the region? What evidence was gathered to show how we know the projects contributed?
- Why were these CD projects successful? What conditions were present that contributed to conflict prevention and/or mitigation? What evidence was gathered to show how we know the contribution of these projects?
- What approaches to community development work best to prevent conflict? What approaches do not work?
- Does it make sense to work in individual communities? Can CD projects transcend communities and alter attitudes and perceptions at regional and/or national levels? Can CD projects be replicated to reach national-level conflict risks?
- When is community development appropriate? Under what conditions, if any, would you not want to pursue community development? What conditions would not be appropriate for CD projects
- Which approaches have given the E&E Bureau the largest return? What are the common denominators for those CD projects that have been most successful at bridging the divide between conflicting groups?
- Are certain socio/political environments more conducive to implementation of CD projects than others? Do different environments require different approaches?

Obstacles

- What are the key obstacles to implementing CD projects?
- Are there common obstacles across the E&E region or across sub-regions? Are the obstacles beyond the capacity of USAID?
- Have CD projects found approaches to overcome obstacles?

IV. CONTRACTOR TASKS AND DURATION OF TASKS

The assessment team will review relevant literature, develop testable hypotheses that link conflict prevention, resolution, and mitigation and community development, and - in accordance with that model - collect quantitative and qualitative information on the three USAID projects (CAR or Georgia, Macedonia, Serbia). For each of the three program CD project assessments, the contractor will provide a comprehensive report describing and analyzing the findings, conclusions, and lessons learned.

A. Phase I: Literature Review and Development of a Working Hypotheses (20 days)

As a first step in the assessment process, the contractor shall review USAID historical documents and summaries of relevant country-level strategic objectives and program summaries, as well as key home-office contractor/grantee documents on CD programs from USAID's most significant implementing partners. As these documents are not exhaustive, the team will be responsible for identifying and reviewing additional materials (academic, evaluations and assessments of other donor CD programs, etc) relevant to the assessment.

The contractor will use this literature to provide an initial response to the illustrative research questions identified above, and to set forth hypothesized cause-effect relations that can be examined in the field. USAID expects that the research design for fieldwork will be adequate to "test" this model and its assumptions, although it is understood that evidence may be qualitative in nature. The quality/validity of the research design will be a key element of the selection criteria (30 percent).

B. Phase 2: Planning and Conducting Fieldwork (20 days/country - 3 countries)

As noted above, USAID (in consultation with the CAR, Georgia, Macedonia and Serbia Missions) will identify three CD programs to assess. The contractor will be responsible for developing a research plan for each CD project evaluation that discusses the objectives, methodology to be employed, and the most salient issues and aspects of the program to examine. USAID will review and approve the research plan prior to fieldwork. The contractor will be responsible for providing a report and both a Mission and E&E Bureau debrief following each CD program evaluation.

C. Phase 3: Final Assessment Report – Conclusions (15 days)

The final phase of this assessment will be for the contractor to carry out data analysis and submit a draft and a final assessment report for E&E Bureau and USAID Mission comment and review. USAID will provide written comments on the draft report within 15 days. The contractor will in turn revise the draft report, reflecting USAID's comments/suggestions, within 15 days of receipt of these written comments. Following acceptance of the report by USAID (CTO/evaluation officer) the contractor will then provide USAID with electronic and (100) bound copies of the final report. In addition, the contractor will arrange a briefing for USAID/W staff to discuss the report.

V. Methodology

The contractor will designate a team (subject to USAID approval), to design an assessment methodology plan; carry out a comprehensive literature review and develop hypothesized cause-effect relationships; conduct field research in three countries and provide written and verbal reports after each; analyze the data and compile key findings; draft and obtain USAID/W acceptance of the final report, and orally present the findings to the Bureau.

Before beginning and after completing each of the three phases discussed above, the contractor will meet with an advisory group of USAID staff in E&E/Program Office , which may also include select E&E Technical Offices and Pillar Bureau staff, to review products and progress and agree on next steps.

After the literature review (phase I) and prior to fieldwork (phase II), the contractor will provide evidence to USAID that the logistical arrangements for the fieldwork are in place. The contractor will carry out site visits to Georgia or the Central Asia Republics, Macedonia, and Serbia. As noted above, the end of each country visit, the contractor will provide to the Mission and AID/W a draft of the country report and provide an oral debriefing.

At the end of Phase III, the contractor will have submitted a final synthesis report acceptable to USAID.

VI. USAID'S ROLE IN THE ASSESSMENT

The E&E Bureau will:

- organize a small USAID advisory group for implementation of this scope of work;
- provide programmatic and budgetary information to the team;
- provide project documents and evaluations to the team;
- facilitate additional information-gathering;
- facilitate obtaining USAID/Mission input
- arrange USAID/Washington meetings

In some instances (though the contractor should not depend on this) an additional “team member” may be assigned by the USAID/Mission in each country/region where a program evaluation takes place. In all cases, USAID Mission staff and/or the USAID team members will be available to assist the contractor in providing in-depth knowledge of the various projects and activities that are being evaluated.

VII. CONTRACTOR EXPERTISE AND LEVEL OF EFFORT

The EE Bureau Division Chief (or designate) will serve as CTO and must approve all experts suggested for this project. Changes in key personnel or the work plan must be approved by the CTO.

VIII. DELIVERABLES

The contractor's deliverables shall include:

- A written methodology plan (research design and operational workplan);
- Conducting a comprehensive literature review
- Developing hypothesized cause-effect relationships from the literature review
- Identifying and refining key research questions,
- Developing appropriate research instruments for field work,
- Presenting written and verbal CD country reports (before departing the country and subsequently in AID/W)
- Analyzing data and identifying key findings
- Submitting the draft final report (electronic and hard copy) to AID/W (within one month after completing the last country evaluation) for comments. USAID will be responsible for distributing the report to the USAID Missions and for compiling comments regarding the document to the contractor. USAID/W will provide the assessment team with a written comments within three weeks of receiving the draft report. Three weeks after USAID's comments are provide, a final report will be due to USAID/W. An oral presentation of the assessment findings is to be provided to USAID/W within two months of approval and acceptance of the final report.

IX. TEAM COMPOSITION

For planning purposes, the team for this assessment will consist of up to four members, as described below. However, USAID encourages prospective contractors to come up with alternative staffing scenarios on taking into account the objectives of this assessment, our illustrative budget, and our proposed methodology. USAID/W must approve all individuals proposed for the team.

1. Senior Level Social Science Analyst/Team Leader: Strong leadership skills. Knowledge of USAID and the E&E region is desired. Must be able to participate in the entire assessment, with overall responsibility for producing the final report. This person will have substantial experience in evaluating CD projects and must provide evidence of having worked with CD projects that are designed to be a conflict prevention or conflict resolution tool.
2. Mid Level Democracy & Governance Analyst (expert on conflict analysis): Researcher with proven research/conceptual understanding and experience in understanding, analyzing and publishing on conflict prevention and mitigation in Europe and Eurasia.
3. Mid Level Evaluation Methods Analyst (with Community Development Program experience): Expertise in design and evaluation of CD activities.
4. Administrative Support (mid level)

X. LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

The team will be responsible for all AID/W and in-country logistical support. This includes responsibility for scheduling, hotel accommodations, arranging for all in-country transportation (including vehicle rental and drivers), arranging for interpreters/translation services, and attending to all other administrative issues. The contractor shall work closely with each USAID Mission on schedules.

XI. ILLUSTRATIVE SCHEDULE

It is anticipated that the assessment will be completed in approximately nine months from the award of the contract.

XII. ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET

The contractor is asked to submit a proposed budget that separates salaries, international travel, in-country expenses, materials development, and miscellaneous DC-based costs. The budget should assume fieldwork in CAR, Macedonia and Serbia. A detailed illustrative budget is provided as Budget Annex 1.

Budget Summary

Fully Loaded Labor Costs	\$177,435
Total Travel and Per Diem	\$74,115
Other ODC and G&A	\$11,867
Total	\$268,417

Assessment Factors

Firms submitting a proposal to provide services under the CDIE IQC Task Order for the CD and Conflict Assessment should explain how they would do the assessment. The information provided should be 15 single-spaced pages or less (not including resumes). Prospective contractors should list staff proposed for this task order; include their resumes and statements of availability.

The selection criteria/assessment factors are as follows:

Personnel – (50 percent) - The experience, expertise and knowledge of all key staff.

Overall Research Design – (30 percent) - Quality of contractor's overall research design. Prospective contractors shall describe their overall approach to this scope, including how they propose to carry out each phase of the work.. This description should include a work plan that identifies all staff requirements and discusses/justifies the contractor's proposed research design.

Past Performance and Corporate Capabilities (20 percent) - Prior experience and track record of contractor in design, management and conduct of community development and conflict assessment, and/or in carrying out similar assessments.

ATTACHMENT A

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN THE EE REGION Country, Name of Program, SO, Relevant Evaluations, Description where available

1. Bosnia-Herzegovina
 - The Municipal Infrastructure Services Program (*BiH Impact Study Final Report*. PriceWaterhouse Coopers. August 2000.)
 - Business Development Program
2. Bulgaria
 - FLAG
 - Roma program
3. Central Asian Republics
 - Community Action Investment Program

"The CAIP builds on the success of other small community grants in current health, civil society and Tajikistan programs to strengthen community action for micro-credit and job creation, and social infrastructure improvements in health facilities, schools, water supply and community centers. It focuses on the southern areas of each republic, where the potential for conflict (poverty, ethnic differences, growth of Hizb-u-Tahir) appears greatest." **Source:** Cover memo from Annual Report Submission, February 2002.
 - Kyrgyzstan: community grants where local government and citizens can submit a project and received small grant (\$2-3,000)
 - Uzbekistan: Counterpart Consortium has social partnerships
4. Cyprus
 - Department of Labor projects for local economic development
 - Hungary
 - contact person is Liz Mckeen in EEST
6. Kosovo
 - OTI program (*Transitioning to Long-Term Development: An Evaluation of the USAID/OTI Program in Kosovo*, ARD, Inc. November 2001)
 - Follow-up to OTI program
7. Macedonia
 - Youth employment program and other underserved communities
8. Serbia
 - OTI program
 - New program under SO 2.0.
9. Ukraine
 - Community Partnerships (SO 2.1)

ATTACHMENT B
Preliminary List of Reference Materials

Beyna, Larry S. et. al. *The Effectiveness of Civil Society Initiatives in Controlling Violent Conflicts and Building Peace: A Study of Three Approaches in the Greater Horn of Africa*. USAID. June 2001.

Democracy Impacts for Central Asia (October 1, 1997 through June 30, 2001), 2001. Counterpart International.

Kumar, Krishna. *Aftermath : Women and Women's Organizations in Postconflict Societies*. Conwal, Inc. | USAID. Bureau. for Policy and Program Coordination. Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) Series: USAID evaluation highlights, no. 74

Mobilizing Community Resources for Local Economic Development: Report on a Regional Conference, 1998. USAID, the International City/County Management Association, the Council for Urban Economic Development, and Aguirre Associates.

Morfit., Michael. *Shifting the Conflict Lens: A Social Capital Approach to Conflict Prevention*, 2002. Development Alternatives, Inc.

Office of Women and Development. *Intrastate Conflict and Gender*. Information Bulletin No. 9, December 2000. USAID

Practicing Community-Based Conflict Mitigation: Executive Summary, 1995. U.S. Department of State, USAID.

Robert Putnam *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. 2000

Review and Evaluation of Community Development Programs in Armenia. 1998. Save the Children. (Prepared for USAID).

The Role of Foreign Assistance in Conflict Prevention: Conference Report, 2001. USAID, U.S. Smithsonian Institution, and Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Uphoff, Norman T. "Ethnic Conflict in Sri Lanka: Through the Keyhole of a USAID Project." In *Carrots, Sticks, and Ethnic Conflict: Rethinking Development Assistance*, Milton J. Esman and Ronald J. Herring, eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Understanding Local Economic Development in the CEE/NIS Region: An Introduction, 1998. The Council for Urban Economic Development.

USAID/BHR/OFDA, USAID/AFR and DOS/AF. *Practicing Community-Based Conflict Mitigation. Executive Summary.* A Workshop Co-sponsored by, USAID/AFR, and DOS/AF. Marcy 29 & 30, 1995.

USAID. *Democracy Dialogue: Preventing and Managing Deadly Conflict through Democracy Assistance.* December 2001.

USAID. *Strategic Plan for Georgia.* Fy 2000-FY 2003. June 1999.

Varshney, Ashutosh. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

ATTACHMENT C
MISSION LEVEL EVALUATIONS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
PROJECTS

Albania

Gruenloh, Carrie A. *Albanian Social Sector Rehabilitation and Support Program (SSRP/A). External Evaluation Report*. September 27, 2001. (Major goal of the program was to support local communities directly affected by the influx of refugees. The primary tool was the use of grants to NGO, that in turn were to increase community involvement.)

Armenia

Dershem, Larry. *Review and Evaluation of Community Development Program*. Save the Children/Armenian Field Office. February 11, 1998. (Among the reported impacts was an improvement in social capital [inter-and extra-local linkages between community groups, new local NGOs, governmental structures and extra-local organizations])

Bosnia-Herzegovina

PricewaterhouseCoopers. *BiH Impact Study*. Final Report. August 2000. (Addresses the impact of the Municipal Infrastructure Services Program and CIRP on community relations, concluding that relations between domicile population and returnees had improved significantly. Program goal was not worded as conflict mitigation).

Central Asian Republics

Adamson, Fiona B. *Building Civil Society From the Outside: An Evaluation of Democracy Assistance Strategies in Uzbekistan and Krygyzstan*. No date. (Cites as one of the achievements "a limited number of small-scale community development successes" and identifies "a need for more community development projects in the region.")

Kosovo

Garner, David Altus and Michael Gaffen. *Evaluation of "Parsons I" Project for USAID/Kosovo*. September 6, 2001. Louis Berger Group

Morin, Robert J. and Dana S. Stinson. *Transitioning to Long-Term Development: An Evaluation of the USAID/OTI Program in Kosovo*. November 2001.